

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

HANIF ASIM SAEED,

Petitioner,

v.

THOMAS S. MCGINLEY, *et al.*,

Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 18-00906

ORDER

AND NOW, this 25th day of November 2019, upon consideration of the Amended Petition for a Writ of *Habeas Corpus* and accompanying Memorandum of Law, (ECF No. 10), Respondents' Response in Opposition, (ECF No. 17), and the Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge David Strawbridge, (ECF No. 18), it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge Strawbridge's Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;¹
2. Saeed's Petition for a Writ of *Habeas Corpus* is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED with prejudice**;
3. No certificate of appealability shall issue;²

¹ There are no objections to the Report and Recommendation. When no objection is made to a report and recommendation, the court should, as a matter of good practice, "satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's notes; *see also Oldrati v. Apfel*, 33 F. Supp. 2d 397, 399 (E.D. Pa. 1998) ("In the absence of a timely objection, therefore, this Court will review [a] Magistrate Judge[s] . . . Report and Recommendation for 'clear error.'"). No clear error appears on the face of the record and the Court accordingly accepts Judge Strawbridge's recommendation.

² Reasonable jurists would not debate the Court's disposition of petitioner's claims. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

4. This case shall be **CLOSED** for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Gerald J. Pappert
GERALD J. PAPPERT, J.